

Atty. Docket No.: PC-930

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICERECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 13 2006

Applicant: ANNE E. ROBB
Serial No.: 09/755,442
Filed: 01/05/2001
For: RECURSIVE METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR ACCESSING
CLASSIFICATION INFORMATION
Examiner: GART, MATTHEW S Group: 3625

ELECTIONCommissioner of Patents
And Trademarks

Honorable Commissioner:

I enclose the following papers:

1. ELECTION

Please enter the above correspondence.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Steinberger
PTO Registration No. 36,423
Client No. 23717
101 Brevard Avenue
Cocoa, FL 32922
(321) 633-5080
Facsimile (321) 633-9322

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE (37 CFR 1.8a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office to 1-571-273-8300 totaling 3 pages

2/13 .2006
Date

Brian S. Steinberger
(Name of Person Transmitting Paper)


(Signature of Person Transmitting Paper)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty. Docket No.: PC-930

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 13 2006

Applicant: ANNE E. ROBB
Serial No.: 09/755,442
Filed: 01/05/2001
For: RECURSIVE METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR ACCESSING
CLASSIFICATION INFORMATION
Examiner: GART, MATTHEW S Group: 3625

ELECTION

Commissioner of Patents
And Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed January 13, 2006, Applicant elects to prosecute with traverse Invention I, claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-14, 16, and 23-24, drawn to a method of accessing classification information on a web based system through handheld display devices, classified in class 705, subclass 26.

Based on the restriction requirement, Applicant lists inventions readable thereon as follows:

Invention I: Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-14, 16, and 23-24, drawn to a method of accessing classification information on a web based system through handheld display devices, classified in class 705, subclass 26.

Invention II: Claim 20, drawn to a method of accessing classification information on a web based system through handheld display devices, comprising the steps of allowing the external end user to dynamically update at least one of the category headings and the first subcategory headings through the handheld device, classified in class 705, subclass 26.

Invention III: Claims 26-27, drawn to a method of accessing and placing classification information on a web based system using handheld display devices, classified in class 705, subclass 26.

Atty. Docket No.: PC-930

Invention IV: Claims 28-29, drawn to a method of accessing and placing classification information on a web based system using handheld display devices comprising the steps of selectively placing banner advertisements, classified in class 705, subclass 26.

Applicant agrees the subject invention covers four different inventions. However, applicant disagrees with the restriction for other reasons.

A policy consideration behind a restriction requirement would suggest that separate inventions exists that inherently would include separate prior art searches, examinations, examiners, etc.

The examiner has not stated that separate searches and separate examiners and separate art units are necessary to examine these inventions.


Further, multiple examinations on these inventions would be repetitive and excessive. Separate prosecution can create an unnecessary financial burden for both the Applicant and the Patent Office. If both all of the Inventions I-IV, can be searched by the same art unit and further by the same examiner, then having different examiners conduct separate searches and examinations would create an undue time and financial burden on both the patent office and on the applicant.

For these reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

In reference to the restriction requirement, Applicant again wishes to make their election to prosecute the Invention I, claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-14, 16 and 23-24 with traverse. If further restrictions are merited, please let us know.

Thus, for the above reasons, the restriction requirement is not proper and Applicant respectfully requests removal of the restriction requirement.

Respectfully submitted:



Brian S. Steinberger, Esq.
Registration No. 36, 423
Law Offices of Brian S. Steinberger, P.A.
101 Brevard Avenue
Cocoa, FL 32922
Telephone: (321) 633-5080 Fax: (321) 633-9322

Date 2/13/06